



B

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Case No. 99,921-A)

In the Application of)
)
A. Joseph Mueller and R. John Rosenlof)
) Confirmation No. 3094
Serial No.: 09/703,338)
) Group Art Unit: 2631
Filed: October 31, 2000)
)
For: Method and System for Analytically)
 Computing and Using an ANSpecm Signal)

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Sir:

In regard to the above identified application:

1. We are transmitting herewith the attached:

A. Comments on Examiner's Amendment and on Reasons for Allowance; and
B. Return Receipt Postcard.

2. With respect to additional fees, no additional fee is required.

3. Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2490. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

4. CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8: The undersigned also hereby certifies that this Transmittal Letter and the paper, as described in paragraph 1 hereinabove, are being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313 on this 30th day of March, 2004.

By: 
Lawrence H. Aaronson
Reg. No. 35,818



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Case No. 99,921-A)

In re the Application of:)
A. Joseph Mueller and R. John Rosenlof)
Serial No.: 09/703,338) Group Art Unit 2631
Filed: October 31, 2000) Examiner: Khai Tran
For: Method and System for Analytically) Confirmation No. 3094
Computing and Using an ANSpecm Signal)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT
AND ON REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Dear Sir:

With the Notice of Allowance mailed March 19, 2004, the Examiner entered an Examiner's Amendment and set forth Reasons for Allowance. Applicant submits these comments regarding those two items.

By the Examiner's Amendment, as authorized by the undersigned, the Examiner changed two instances of the term "predefined" to read "predetermined" instead. The reason for this change was strictly for consistency of terminology. The Examiner and the undersigned agreed that the terms mean the same thing. As such, the amendment did not narrow or change the scope of the claims.

In the Reasons for Allowance, the Examiner seems to have paraphrased some of Applicant's claims. Applicant understands, however, that the Examiner has found the invention

as claimed in claims 1-58 to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Therefore, to the extent any paraphrasing of the claims diverges from the literal or equivalent meaning of the claims as allowed, Applicant does not acquiesce in the paraphrasing of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF**

Date: March 30, 2004

By:



Lawrence H. Aaronson
Reg. No. 35,818